



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

PD

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/223,957	12/31/98	DALE	R OLIG-0004

BOZICEVIC & REED
285 HAMILTON AVENUE
SUITE 200
PALO ALTO CA 94301

HM22/1206

EXAMINER	
KUNZ, G	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1623	8

DATE MAILED: 12/06/99

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run _____ or continues to run _____ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☒ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 11-23-99 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☐ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____
Claims objected to: _____
Claims rejected: _____

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because SEE ATTACHMENT

5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.


☒ Other SEE ATTACHMENT

09/223,957
PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89)

Art Unit: 1623

SUPPLEMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION

The obviousness rejection of record is maintained because the amendment to the claims simply omits the SepPak hydrophobic matrix and cites specific known highly hydrophobic polymers. The applicant argues that protocol for using the SepPak requires a volatile salt for washing instead of using water only for washing. This argument has been fully considered but is not deemed persuasive. The protocol for desalting 40 nm of oligonucleotides from the Lineberger Nucleic Acids Core Facility web site teaches precisely that the SepPak will bind nucleic acids and then permit a washing step using water followed by an elution step using 60% methanol. There is no substantial difference in the actual protocols claimed by the applicant and that taught by the prior art except the precise type of highly hydrophobic material. However, the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to have substituted other known highly hydrophobic polymers for C18 packing of SepPak cartridges with a reasonable expectation that they would also perform with similar properties to the SepPak for desalting oligonucleotides.


GARY L. KUNZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200